423 44 [773] [224] named that ten is the largest number of traps possible at that weir. Those who have the right to that weir are the members of the ancestral family with the names of those first users. At this point the logic of the Bella Coola fails to uphold the mythological pattern. No salmon-weir has remained in existence since the beginning of time; when one broke, owners were sometimes inferred, and those who repaired the break became regarded as the rightful possessors. The system of ownership prevailing at the time of abandoning the weirs, was that *individuals*, not groups, had rights to certain sections of the weir [428] which were alienable like other personal property. In most cases this right was transmitted with a name, marking the section of weir, which had to be duly validated by presents. [431] [428] In other cases, the intangible ownership was willed without any mark whatever.* Unless bequeathed in this way, disputes were frequent. Rights of this kind were never sold although [427] an owner often loaned his section for a night, or longer period, [431] receiving goods in return, and not forfeiting his ownership thereby. This was particularly common when the owner was planning to give a potlatch. No case was heard of in which the right to a certain section of salmon-weir was given to a non-member of the ancestral family. Theoretically, this was possible, but practically it would be so inconvenient that it is most unlikely ever to have occurred, since the Bella Coola is • [671] never such a slave to legal privileges that he fails to be guided by common sense.

826 [428] [577] [624] Although individual ownership is thus recognized with regard to sections of salmon-weirs and suitable places for shellfish-rocks, the owner is bound to share his haul. When he catches a large number of fish, anyone, whether related to him or not, can demand some. He cannot refuse, since to do so would brand him as selfish. The effective check on this system

[128]

*Great difficulty was experienced in learning about the distribution of rights to sections of salmon-weirs. The evidence is conflicting, and though every effort was made to verify and check the above, there may be further regulations which were not known.

Library of the Dartmouth E-5 (1922-1924)1948
NEA Bellacrolla NEA

as far as incest rules are concerned. In this particular instance the woman did not show any interest in her new relatives, failed to visit them, or to take part in their ceremonies, so that the adoption, though still legal, has practically lapsed. When this man dies his children will not consider the claims of their father's "sister" to inherit any of his possessions, as they would have done if she had showed herself appreciative of her adoption.

It will thus be seen that the size and composition of the family vary according to the wealth and influence of the father. The duties of the members are difficult to define since they concern almost entirely the routine of life. The father, head of the family, directs the gathering of firewood, repair of the house, obtaining of food supplies, and other matters of the same sort. If he grows a patriarch his children must help him, which they do willingly since they gain from the ceremony. If a father is too autocratic, his older, especially his married children, simply move away. Nor is his power over his younger children unbounded, since their mother's relatives take great interest in their welfare and would censure any ill-treatment.

If a person is killed or wounded, revenge is the affair of his family. Just how many individuals are involved depends on the composition of the family. In the case of the killing of a child, living with his parents alone, none but the father would feel it incumbent to vindicate. If an adult person is murdered, his or her brothers feel and revenge the insult. But should an important member of the community be slain, an old man surrounded by a numerous family, it is the affair of all. Every effort is made to slay the murderer, but if he should escape from the country, the injured group is satisfied by killing one of his family. Here again the same interest composition is found. A man's son, brother, or father are the only persons ordinarily liable, and even here the common sense of the Indio Canlo outweighs their theoretical laws. A murderer's brother, living in another village, would not be held liable, but more distant relatives living with the offender and considered as his family are liable.